

Attendees: Kimberly Buhl, Jose Lozano, Brian Eden, Hilary Lambert, Roxy Johnston, Bob Johnson, Linda Wagenet, Liz Moran, Jim McGarry, Rich DePaulo, Joan Jurkowich, Jeff Myers, Steve Penningroth, Bill Foster, Bert Bland

1. Review of May notes

Q: Rich - What will be done with the notes?

A: Roxy - They will be posted on County Planning's website for the WRC.

- Joan - The website will be upgraded soon to (hopefully) improve accessibility. The time frame for completion of the upgrade is uncertain.
- No changes to the notes were suggested.

2. Data submission

Local data

- Important local data sets have been submitted, including Bob's historical plant monitoring data in the south end of the lake.
- Some reports may still need included in the 'collection'
- Joe Makarewicz submitted data on the north end of Cayuga Lake directly to UFI
- Bob has older plant data from the northern portion of the lake and will submit it

MS4 annual reports

- Jeff - MS4 reporting doesn't require monitoring so there is no data.
- Brian – Is runoff from lake side development being captured? It may be a significant contribution Jeff - agrees about importance of capturing inputs but MS4 permits will not capture it. The project's tributary monitoring may capture some of these inputs.

3. Review Ecologic's process for incorporating data submissions

- Ecologic distributed a draft matrix (see attached) that catalogs available data by:
 - Site
 - Number of sampling stations and names
 - Parameters analyzed and number of observations
 - Years collected
 - Data source
- This metadata (information about the data) is being shared with UFI and kept on the project website.
- It is a nice representation of monitoring that has been done in the community.
- Dave Bouldin's data has particular value in that the Fall Creek data is both extensive and can be related to flows via a USGS gage. He also has a limited data set comparing Six Mile Creek and the Inlet to Fall Creek.

- CSI has an extensive database, not all parameters are captured on Ecologic's matrix. Liz will update the matrix. Jose's lake monitoring data is also missing, Liz will add it.
 - Liz will send an electronic copy of the matrix to the MP for review to see if any other corrections or additions are needed.
 - Q: Steve – what is an observation?
 - A: Liz will clarify
4. Review posted project data, update on BAC vs Tn
- Without a projector it is hard for the group to review the data. Roxy will have a projector for the next meeting.
 - No further information on BAC vs Tn other than UFI prefers BAC
5. Public Meeting, final agenda, simulcasting?
- Simulcasting is very expensive and will not be set up for tomorrow's public meeting. It can be considered for future meetings, based on demand. Hilary will seek input from Seneca and Cayuga county representatives about the need/desire for public meetings.
6. Update on TAC
- Jeff – Still working out details of charge and members, in general these are the goals:

Members

- Specific expertise, highly technical
- Jay Bloomfield, DEC, will chair
- USGS, EPA and MP may be asked to send representatives
- Balance local and non-watershed participants/perspectives

Charge

- Review project
- Identify issues and suggest possible improvements
- Provide independent oversight
- May identify topics for public meetings
- May follow up on issues raised at MP meetings

Structure

- Quarterly teleconferences
 - Finalize structure at a summer 2013 initial meeting and review current data
 - Second meeting in fall TAC will be operating at full capacity
-
- Jeff – TAC and public meetings will have very different focuses. TAC will focus on technical aspects of the project. Public meetings and later stakeholder groups will review broad lake management topics.

Q: Rich, will there be a public record of the TAC meetings?

A: Jeff likes the idea and may put minutes on the DEC website.

Q: Jose – Looking for clarification that the TAC is not the same as a TMDL stakeholder group

A: Jeff confirmed they will be different groups.

7. Discuss designated uses, narrative standards and ecological conditions

- Jeff – willing to have a general conversation about appropriate uses on the south end of Cayuga Lake and what uses should be restored. Standards may allow for protection of water quality while still precluding public bathing – need to review language regarding the specific standards, etc.
- DEC makes all reasonable efforts to meet water quality standards and realize designated uses. When above conditions can't be met, a Use Attainability Analysis is done, this also involves a public dialogue regarding uses.
- Jeff – Litigation around the CWA positioned TMDL's as capable of solving all water quality problems. Reality is that TMDL's aren't that flexible and can be triggered anytime a standard is exceeded even though they may not be the most effective or productive way to address a problem.
- Steve P - TMDL's are crafted in response to degrading water quality and loss of designated uses.....public swimming was not a 'use' post 1972, when the Clean Water Act (CWA) was established, and therefore should not be a factor in assessing lake conditions or management.
- Rich – Scientific community in favor of letting south end of the lake become a marsh, public is not.

Q: Jose – looking to confirm there will be a TMDL stakeholder group, wonders if this discussion should be delayed until later and for such a group.

A: Jeff – Agrees that having the discussion with a TMDL stakeholder group is better. Sees phasing as such: Impairment, collect data from the study, resolve data with internal/natural process, allocate other inputs, determine feasibility, then address the TMDL

Q: Steve - what use is considered impaired by the DEC?

- Bill – agrees TMDL conversation is premature
- Roxy – Is concerned that a TMDL is a foregone conclusion and concerned that later conversations will be 'too late' to fundamentally change directions.
- Bill – Public on the Floating Classroom and Farmer's Market tours not in favor of swimming. Notes that lake conditions have improved noticeably on the east shore. Steve – concurs that east shore water quality conditions have improved.
- Rich – it's a matter of timing, swimming is not a good idea in current conditions but public willing to entertain measures that would create favorable swimming conditions off Stewart Park.
- Jeff – Does sound like there would be value in having an earlier public discussion on lake conditions, etc., not specific regulatory processes. DEC is not in a position to host such a meeting.

- Hilary – The Network might be interested in facilitating this discussion and thinks it would be a great way to get information to the public about natural functions and essential good health of the lake.

8. Adjourn